

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/039,260	ABERG ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	L. E. Crane	1623	

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** after final rejection

(1) L. E. Crane.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Anthony M. Insogna (response to voice mail).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 19 December 2005

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:  
None

Claims discussed:  
None


Prior art documents discussed:  
None

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  
See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Applicant's representative objected to some portions of the interview summary of the interview conducted on 12/13/2005.

Applicant's representative's objections were as follows:

- i) he did not like the notation of his own disparaging remarks regarding the newly submitted declaration and failure to repeat or explain said remarks,
- ii) he did not like repetition of his description of a portion of examiner's analysis of the Storm declaration in an Office action as an example of examiner sarcasm,
- iii) he did not like what applicant's representative characterized as an overemphasis on the Storm declaration, and
- iv) he did not like the failure to discuss newly submitted documents first made available to examiner's during the interview and not yet made of record.

Examiner responds that the record appeared to be accurate and that applicant had not made any criticism which suggested that a factual error has been made.

Documents made of record must be reviewed by the assigned examiner during the normal course of examination, and this will happen when the documents in question are made of record by applicant.

Applicant's representative is reminded that he is free to submit his own recapitulation of the interview as a separate filing or as part of the next response to the Office action of record.

Examiner also replied (by voice mail) that the interview had already been sent for scanning and that the SPE who read, reviewed, and approved the interview summary prior to a copy being FAXed to Mr. Choi was James O. Wilson and that all complaints not made directly to instant examiner should be forwarded to Mr. Wilson who may be reached at the telephone number provided in previous recent Office actions.